

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 361

CE 016 572

AUTHOR Bina, James V.; Hull, William L.
TITLE Demonstration Projects: Implementation and Institutionalization.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 18p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Role; Audiences; *Demonstration Projects; *Guidelines; National Surveys; *Organizational Communication; *Program Development
IDENTIFIERS Project Directors

ABSTRACT

Three purposes are listed for this paper: (1) to share the results of a national survey of vocational education exemplary projects; (2) to emphasize the importance of a project director's communication with five clientele audiences; and (3) to suggest specific actions likely to result in institutionalization of a demonstration project. A brief procedural overview is presented of the national survey which investigated the activities of demonstration project directors through questionnaire/interview contacts with two groups: a primary population consisting of the project directors of the projects funded between 1970 and 1973; and a secondary population consisting of the sites using results from the projects. The remainder of the paper is an outline listing suggested activities of project directors which, based on the study findings, can lead to effective implementation and institutionalization. The activities are listed as they relate to five key clientele audiences: host site decision makers, project staff, community representatives, students, and potential replication site representatives. Because timing is a critical factor in the success of a project, the suggested activities with each audience are discussed in relation to three phases of a project: pre-grant period, grant period, and post-grant period. In summary, a list is provided of eight suggested guidelines for project directors as they implement a demonstration project. (VB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED1555361

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS: IMPLEMENTATION AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION

James V. Bina
William L. Hull

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Magisos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

OE 016 572

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS: IMPLEMENTATION AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION¹

INTRODUCTION

The demonstration project represents one of the most cost-effective and beneficial ways of implementing innovations known today. Demonstration projects are one of the most promising activities in the continuing effort to improve education in general. This discussion focuses on demonstration projects in Vocational Education. Public Law 90-576 of 1968 brought Federal support of demonstration projects to Vocational Education in order to increase the use of tested materials and activities in local school districts. In July 1970 the first projects were initiated.

There are two primary audiences for a demonstration project: (1) persons in other school districts who are in a position to accept, modify, or reject the innovation, and (2) persons in the host district who are likely to continue or discontinue the innovation being demonstrated. Success may be defined by either audience: the spread of the innovation to other school districts or the institutionalization of the project on site. Implementation, for purposes of this discussion, is defined as the planning and operating dimensions of a demonstration project.

¹This paper is a revised version of a February 28, 1978, presentation titled, Implementing Demonstration Projects. The writers extend their appreciation to Jo-Ann Cherry, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, for her review of this paper.

Demonstration, as it is used in this discussion, is defined as a phase in the diffusion process in which the educational project is exhibited in its specific setting, allowing potential users to observe it in operation, examine evidence of its effectiveness, and judge its potential use in their own educational setting (Hull and Bina, 1977a). This definition is based on the assumption that a validated product or practice is being demonstrated.

Studies such as the COVERD report (1976) found limited documented evidence of the use of tested materials in local school districts. The Rand study (1975) and the Development Associates, Inc. study (1975) reported similar findings. An analysis of these studies (Magisos and Moore, 1977) provides further insights concerning the problem. Available evidence also indicates that even in demonstration sites, optimum use of validated materials and practices rarely takes place when outside funds terminate.

There are three purposes of this paper: (1) to share the results of a national survey of Vocational Education exemplary projects; (2) to emphasize the importance of communicating with five clientele audiences; and (3) to suggest specific actions likely to result in institutionalization of a demonstration project. The following comments are based on the results of this national survey (Hull and Bina, 1977b). A demonstration guide (Bina and Hull, 1977) also has been developed for use by project directors.

OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL STUDY

This discussion is based on a recent national study funded by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, USOE, to investigate activities of the project director of demonstration projects. Two populations were identified: the primary population consisted of the project directors of exemplary projects

funded between 1970 and 1973; and the secondary population consisted of the sites using results from the funded exemplary projects. Both populations were limited to the adjoining 48 states.

The exemplary project director survey had a 92 percent response rate for the 59 sites funded between 1970-1973. The response rate for the sites using the results of exemplary projects was 50 percent of the 78 sites. Interviews were conducted with 26 individuals at 17 different sites in 11 states to obtain perceptions on implementing demonstration projects.

Although project decisions and activities are typically based on judgment, it is important to recognize that the study of activities of demonstration project directors can improve their performance. Although the following is not a comprehensive list, key actions and activities relevant to the majority of demonstration projects have been highlighted. In practice, these actions are not mutually exclusive. The activities will be addressed as they relate to five key clientele audiences: (1) host site decision-makers; (2) project staff; (3) community representatives; (4) students; and (5) potential replication site representatives. Because timing is a critical factor in the success of a project, the specific actions with each audience will be further discussed in the three time phases of a demonstration project: (1) pre-grant period; (2) grant period; and (3) post-grant period. The pre-grant period begins when an idea is being developed for demonstration purposes. Planning is the key activity of this time period. The grant period begins with day one of the funded period. Operating the demonstration project occurs during this time period. The termination of funding initiates the post-grant period. Table 1 on the next page indicates the structure of this paper.

Table 1

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ACTIVITIES BY PROJECT TIME PERIOD AND CLIENTELE AUDIENCES.¹

CLIENTELE AUDIENCES	TIME PERIODS		
	1. Pre-grant	2. Grant	3. Post-grant
1. Host Site Decision- Makers	1.1 1.1.1 1.1.2 1.1.3	1.2 1.2.1 1.2.2 1.2.3 1.2.4	1.3 1.3.1 1.3.2 1.3.3
2. Project Staff	2.1 2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3	2.2 2.2.1 2.2.2 2.2.3 2.2.4 2.2.5	2.3 2.3.1 2.3.2
3. Community Representatives	3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2	3.2 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.2.3 3.2.4	3.3 3.3.1 3.3.2
4. Students	4.1 4.1.1 4.1.2	4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3	4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2
5. Potential Replication Site Representatives	5.1 5.1.1 5.1.2 5.1.3	5.2 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6	5.3 5.3.1 5.3.2

¹ Each cell of the matrix has action statements which are based on findings of the study, perceptions of project directors during site visits, and a review of literature. Specific actions for each number in the cells are discussed in the paper.

The suggested actions are based on the findings of the study, the perceptions shared by project directors and staff during interviews on site, and a review of literature.

1. Host Site Decision-Makers

The project director must relate to the following decision-makers:

(1) funding sponsors, typically the federal government; (2) school district officials including the board of education, the superintendent, the business manager, principals and faculty members at the host site; and (3) state department of education officials.

1.1 Pre-grant activities include:

1.1.1 Submit written project plan to local officials.

The goals and objectives of the project should be consistent with the intent of the sponsor as well as the school district's goals and objectives.

1.1.2 Become familiar with rules and regulations of the school district.

Knowledge of the business procedures of the district is invaluable to the project director. Discuss specific details with the business manager to foster cooperation throughout the project.

1.1.3 Secure tentative endorsement by local officials.

Endorsement by the key decision-makers is an on-going process and is frequently accomplished on an incremental basis. Timing of endorsements is critical. Support from decision-makers should be secured as early as possible. Be prepared to "sell" the project to this key audience.

1.2 During the demonstration grant period the project director can:

1.2.1 Provide results of formative (process) evaluation to decision-makers.

Establish a periodic schedule for providing project feedback based on formative evaluation to decision-makers. A key finding of the study indicated that increased frequency of evaluation enhances project success.

1.2.2 Involve decision-makers on a frequent basis.

Decision-makers should have opportunities to be involved in the project. Project visits by board of education members could be scheduled prior to a regular board meeting. In addition, presentations to the board, administrators and building principals should be conducted.

1.2.3 Seek endorsement of project by school officials.

Decision-makers can use the evaluation results as a basis for continued and increased support. Numerous project directors cited the value of a supportive decision-maker in successful projects.

1.2.4 Develop informal linkages with faculty members.

Faculty members, especially opinion leaders, will be supportive if they are involved. These linkages are developed through formal presentations as well as during informal conversations.

1.3 At the termination of project funds, the actions of the project director can continue to reap benefits. Selected activities of the post-grant phase include:

1.3.1 Provide results of summative (product) evaluation.

Due to busy schedules and competitive forces, the summative evaluation results should be presented to decision-makers in a brief "attention-getting" format. Indicators such as the number of replications should be reported.

1.3.2 Secure adoption by decision-makers.

Adoption of the demonstration on a continued basis requires the decision-makers' participation. Building a base for this action includes passage of board of education resolutions as well as local funding of the project. During site visits project directors of successful projects have cited the importance of an active role by the superintendent.

1.3.3 Integrate project into school district priorities.

Integration of project objectives and activities into the school district requires the support of the total school district. Project institutionalization is often enhanced by the feeling of "ownership" by the key actors in the school district.

2. Project Staff

The project director should keep in mind that the key element of project success is people--namely the project staff. All individuals including the clerical staff are critical to project success.

2.1 The project staff during the pre-grant period should:

2.1.1 Develop written position descriptions.

Written position descriptions should specify required skills, duties and responsibilities. Although the degree of specificity varied, 45 of the 54 projects which were surveyed had developed written position descriptions.

2.1.2 Encourage faculty to nominate project staff.

While retaining the responsibility of hiring and dismissing project staff, the astute project director solicits input on staff selection from numerous sources. Faculty members should be encouraged to nominate individuals. This interaction is an opportunity to increase faculty understanding of the project objectives. Hiring current district staff has both advantages and disadvantages and this decision should be given serious consideration.

2.1.3 Provide pre-service to staff, if necessary.

Regardless of the source (internal or external) of the individuals who are ultimately hired to staff the project, they will have strengths and weaknesses. An assessment of the project needs matched with staff capabilities should identify necessary staff development activities. Hopefully these needs are minimal, however, pre-service needs should be addressed.

2.2 Activities during the grant period include the following:

2.2.1 Provide channels of communication.

Weekly staff meetings is one channel for continuous communication with project staff. To complement scheduled activities, the project director should seek discussions with individual staff members to solicit their ideas and concerns.

2.2.2 Review allocation or "match" of staff time to project tasks.

Since the original objectives and tasks of the demonstration project may change during operation, a periodic review of the "fit" between staff time and project tasks should be conducted. Twenty-nine of the 54 original projects made changes in their objectives.

2.2.3 Provide staff incentives.

Keeping in mind the priority of the project objectives, the project director should be attuned to the professional development needs of individual staff members. Presentations at a conference, writing an article, increased responsibility, and salary increases are excellent staff incentives.

2.2.4 Provide inservice for staff.

Staff inservice on a systematic basis results in a better project. The majority of projects funded between 1970-1973 conducted inservice one to six hours per month. The Rand study (1975) linked the degree of staff inservice with project success. Project directors during site visits cited the stability of staff and inservice as a positive influence on project success.

2.2.5 Evaluate staff members.

Staff evaluation is essential and should be related to the development of future inservice sessions.

2.3 After termination of project funds staff functions include:

2.3.1 Retain some staff on project-related activities.

If continued funding is available from local or other sources, retention of staff for project-related activities will facilitate institutionalization.

2.3.2 Retain staff members in school district in responsible positions.

If funding is not available for retention of staff in project related activities, consider finding responsible positions for them in the school district. Their presence in the district can place them in an advocate position during the institutionalization process.

3. Community Representatives

Community representatives from service organizations, civic organizations, labor unions, businesses, industries, and churches contribute to the effectiveness of a demonstration project.

3.1 Specific actions during the pre-grant phase are:

3.1.1 Conduct needs assessment of community.

Although needs assessment information is a typical requirement for a demonstration project proposal, assessing community needs should be emphasized. Directors of the 1970-1973 projects indicated that asking questions of business, industry and labor representatives had a positive influence on project effectiveness.

3.1.2 Involve key opinion leaders in the proposal development stage.

Key opinion leaders of the community should be invited to serve on the proposal writing team if time permits. As a minimum effort, they should be requested to review the proposal objectives. This activity will foster understanding and frequently will result in endorsement at a future date.

3.2 To increase community involvement during the grant phase, the project director can:

3.2.1 Organize an advisory committee.

A functioning advisory committee can provide input and a continuous review of project activities. Advisory committee members from labor and business had a positive influence on the 1970-1973 projects.

3.2.2 Keep the community informed.

An informed community tends to be supportive. News releases, radio announcements, fliers and newsletters are general vehicles for communicating with the community. Newspaper feature stories were a key communication strategy cited by project directors during site visits.

3.2.3 Make presentations to community groups.

Community organizations such as civic, service, and fraternal groups, are often seeking speakers for their monthly meetings. Project staff as well as the director should capitalize on this communication channel by developing and presenting brief 10-15 minute talks. Audio-visual aids usually strengthen the talk.

3.2.4 Conduct "Open House" sessions.

These sessions provide an opportunity for the community to view the demonstration in action rather than reading reports or newspaper accounts.

3.3 Community support after termination of project funds is essential to institutionalization. A number of actions during the post-grant phase can facilitate this effort:

3.3 Develop a cadre of community advocates for the project.

Specific community individuals should be identified who are willing to be visited, telephoned, or interviewed by representatives of potential replication sites.

3.3.2 Increase community demand.

Individuals in the community can maintain interest in project objectives and activities by advocating continuation. The project director can assist these individuals by providing them with project data in terms of their interests and concerns such as increased employability of students and a lower drop out rate.

• 4. Students

Students are a key focus of a demonstration project. The Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) placed increased emphasis on students.

4.1 In the planning phase prior to actual funding, students and their role in a demonstration project should be emphasized. Activities relevant to students include:

4.1.1 Conduct needs assessment.

Needs assessment of students can be accomplished through a number of approaches. According to directors of the 1970-1973 projects, one approach was the use of existing records such as achievement test results and reading scores. Regardless of the data source, validity and reliability of the data for demonstration project purposes are the two key criteria for all data collection activities.

4.1.2 "Sell" or promote project objectives and activities to students.

Specific plans should be developed concerning the role of students during visits by potential replication site representatives.

4.2 Activities involving project students during the grant period include:

4.2.1 Involve students in demonstration site visits.

Visitors from potential replication sites frequently are interested in student reactions to the project. Insights which students share with visitors may also provide valuable information for the host site.

4.2.2 Evaluate student progress.

Student progress should be evaluated periodically in addition to evaluating project activities such as operating procedures. As previously mentioned the study found increased frequency of evaluation positively influences project effectiveness.

4.2.3 Have student members on the advisory committee.

Membership on the project advisory committee should be extended to students. The study found a positive influence on project effectiveness when students served on the advisory committee.

4.3 Students can be a valuable resource to foster institutionalization in the host site as well as in replication sites. Specific actions include:

4.3.1 Obtain student endorsements.

Student endorsement of project activities will encourage school district officials to continue the project efforts.

4.3.2 Conduct a follow-up study of project students.

A follow-up study of students should be completed a year after they exit the project. This data can be provided to local officials as well as officials of other school districts.

5. Potential Replication Site Representatives

Demonstration projects are designed to increase the use of tested materials and activities in other school districts.

5.1 During the pre-grant period the project director can:

5.1.1 Identify practical strategies to reach potential replication sites.

Strategies such as presentations at a state conference for superintendents should be planned. The timing of these plans is important since being placed on a conference program requires "lead" time.

5.1.2 Build referral linkages.

Identify individuals at key agencies such as the state department of education, colleges, universities, and intermediate school districts who can refer visitors to the demonstration project. Provide sufficient project information to these individuals to allow them to make appropriate referrals.

5.1.3 Develop a detailed dissemination plan.

This plan should specify a geographical target area of school districts which are considered potential replication sites. Specific dissemination activities such as mailing project literature to superintendents should be included in the plan. The pattern of replication reported in the study showed that replication typically occurred in non-adjacent school districts within the state.

5.2 To initiate outreach activities during the grant period the project director can:

5.2.1 Organize demonstration site visits.

Invite visitors to the project on an organized basis. Establish a schedule and an agenda for each visitor or group. Project directors from the 1970-1973 projects suggested identifying one project staff member to coordinate all visits.

5.2.2 Request feedback from site visitors.

Develop a brief feedback form, preferably no more than one page. Request information including their comments about the demonstration project and a brief description of what replication plans they have. Encourage suggestions for improvements for the demonstration project.

5.2.3 Conduct promotional activities.

Promote the project by providing information specifically developed for each unique audience. Awareness literature may be distributed as a general strategy, however, information packaged for a specific group such as superintendents, students, or community representatives tends to be more cost effective.

5.2.4 Have an "open door" option at the host site.

Unexpected visitors will show up at the demonstration site. Development of a general agenda for this type of visit will lessen frustration for project staff as well as for the visitors. The agenda may include clarification of the needs of the visitor's school district.

5.2.5 Monitor records of activities.

Records of activities with potential replication sites should be maintained. These records should include (a) a log of phone calls; (b) a log of visitors, with addresses and phone numbers; (c) agendas for visitors; and (d) visitor feedback forms.

5.2.6 Utilize demonstration teams to visit other school districts.

School districts interested in replicating the demonstration project may request a visit to their district. Demonstration teams responding to these requests may include the project director, a teacher, and, if possible, a student.

5.3 If institutionalization has not occurred, activities with replication sites after project funds terminate are difficult. However, the project director can:

5.3.1 Collect replication data.

Replication data should be collected one or two years after termination of the demonstration project to measure the project's success. If the project is terminated without institutionalization, at least one person should be encouraged to collect and report this information.

5.3.2 Develop a cost-sharing plan for technical assistance.

Requests for technical assistance may arrive after termination of project funds. An optional approach is a cost-sharing plan which would allow project personnel who are district employees to respond to these requests.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, a list of guidelines are suggested for project directors as they implement a demonstration project.

The guidelines include:

1. Develop and maintain channels of communication with clientele audiences.
2. Identify and utilize a cadre of advocates. It may include decision-makers, community representatives, students, etc. Provide recognition for these advocates.
3. Seek incremental commitments for institutionalization of project objectives and activities.
4. Use formative and summative evaluation procedures and report the results to appropriate individuals and groups.
5. Encourage active participation in all phases of the demonstration project by individuals in each key audience.
6. Encourage project staff to develop professionally through inservice, personal encouragement and incentives.
7. Stimulate field-initiated requests. Actively seek opportunities to assist potential replication sites.
8. Determine alternative strategies to achieve institutionalization.

REFERENCES

- Assessing Vocational Education Research and Development. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences. Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development (COVERD), Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences, National Research Council, 1976. ED 128 654.
- Bina, James V. and Hull, William L. Implementing Demonstration Projects. A paper presented at The Second Annual EBCE National Network Conference, Washington, D.C., February 28, 1978.
- Bina, James V. and Hull, William L. Organizing and Conducting Demonstration Projects in Vocational Education. Research and Development Series No. 117. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977. ED 138 113.
- Congress of the United States. Education Amendments of 1976. P.L. 94-482.
- Congress of the United States. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. P.L. 90-576.
- Evaluation of Vocational Exemplary Projects. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Development Associates, Inc., March, 1975. ED 109 475.
- Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, April, 1975. ED 108 328.
- Hull, William L. and Bina, James V. Increasing the Impact of Federally-Administered Vocational Education Exemplary Projects. Leadership Training Series No. 52. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977a. ED 149 031.
- Hull, William L. and Bina, James V. The Influence of Selected Organizational and Administrative Variables on Continued and Extended Use of Exemplary Projects in Vocational Education. Research and Development Series No. 116. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977b. ED 138 114.
- Magisos, Joel H. and Moore, Allen B. Evaluation of Vocational Education R&D Programs. An Integrative Analysis of Recent Studies. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977. ED 142 793.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Abstracts of Exemplary Projects in Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June, 1973. ED 099 518.